REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-31 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 26 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the claimed subject matter. No claims have been added, canceled, or withdrawn. Applicant appreciated the opportunity to discuss the subject matter of the pending claims with the Examiner. This Response and the specified claim amendments are a result of that discussion. In view of these claim amendments and the following remarks, withdrawal of all outstanding rejections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,449 to Gallagher et al. ("Gallagher") in view of U.S. Patent no. 6,691,159 to Grewel et al ("Grewal"). These rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 recites "receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer, the first Web page comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type", "responsive to receiving the request, the first computer: determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first Web page", "generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information", and "providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation". It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does Gallagher in view of Grewal teach or suggest these claimed features.

In addressing claim 1, the 11/03/2004 Office Action ("Action"), at page 3, admits that Gallagher does not teach or suggest "a Web-based UI communication between the first computer and a second computer and determining a set of information that corresponds to the first Web page." Thus, the Action admits that Gallagher does not teach or suggest either of "receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer", and "determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first Web page", as claim 1 recites. To provide these missing features, the Action modifies Gallagher in view of the teachings of Grewal. In view of this modification, the Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the context sensitive help of the Gallagher to include Web-based UI communication to arrive at the recited features of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer, the first Web page comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type". In contrast to the claimed "context-sensitive help" of claim 1, col. 1, lines 53-57 of Gallagher describes that "the user double-clicks on the message, a new Web browser window is displayed which includes an HTML page with the message text, a detailed explanation of the message, and recommended user response" [emphasis added]. The message that is being double-clicked on is a

text-based log message, and the help information presented to the user is help text about the selected log message. Gallagher's selected log message is not part of "a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer". Clearly, Gallagher is not teaching or suggesting that the user select the log message to obtain specific contextual information about the UI object (e.g., a text UI control) that underlies the log message. Instead, Gallagher discloses that responsive to log message selection, the system of Gallagher retrieves and presents content-specific information to the user about the log message. This is content-specific help, not context-sensitive help. It is respectfully submitted that the content specific help taught by Gallagher is not "context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type", as claim 1 recites.

The Action modifies Gallagher in view of Grewal for the teaching of "receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer", and "responsive to receiving the request, the first computer: determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first Web page", as claim 1 recited prior to amendment. To address each of the claimed features, claim 1 as amended recites "receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer, the first Web page comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type", "responsive to receiving the request, the first computer: determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds

to the first Web page", "generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information", and "providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation". Modifying Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest any such "context sensitive help" for the following reasons.

The Abstract of Grewal, and at col. 1, lines 40-43, clearly disclose and suggest a system to provide users "with education, information and computer assisted help on a specific subject, problem, or a project." To these ends, Grewal at cols. 3 and 4 describes user interfaces of Figs. 4 and 5, which provide hypertext links for a user to link to FAQs, articles, tips and tricks, tutorials, etc., chat and e-mail capabilities, keyword searches, and so on. Applicant respectfully submits that "help on a specific subject, problem, or a project" provided by links to FAQs, articles, tips and tricks, tutorials, etc., chat and e-mail capabilities, keyword searches, and so on, is not "context sensitive help", as claim 1 recites.

Referring to those portions of Grewal cited by the Action. Grewal at col. 2, lines 22-37 clearly teaches:

> "FIG. 1 is a block diagram of a system 10 in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. System 10 includes a server system 12 and a plurality of client systems 14 connected to server system 12. In one embodiment, a client system 14 is a computer including a web browser. Server system 12 is accessible to client system 14 via the Internet. Client system 14 is interconnected to the Internet through many interfaces including dial-in-connections, cable modems, special high- speed ISDN lines and networks such as local area networks (LANs) or wide area networks (WANs). Client system 14 could be any client system capable of interconnecting to the Internet including a web-based phone or other web-based connectable equipment. Servers storing information are integrated with server system 12 and can be accessed by potential users at one of client systems 14 by logging onto server system 12."

Although this portion of Grewal teaches a plurality of client systems can access a server system, this cited portion does not teach or suggest "providing context-sensitive help from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer", and "the first Web page comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type", as claim 1 recites.

Referring now to Grewal at col. 4, lines 46-65 (i.e., another portion of Grewal cited by the action to support the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 1), Grewal explicitly teaches:

> *"FIG. 8 describes an algorithm 240 as used by the system to help a user when the user logs on to a home page of the web site through client system 14. After logging 242, the user requests help through client system 14 by selecting one of a hypertext link displayed out of all displayed 244 hypertext links. Once the user makes a specific selection, the specific selection is sent to server system 12. The sending 246 is accomplished in response to click of a mouse or to a voice command. Once server system 12 receives 248 the request, server system 12 displays the information in response to this request on client system 14. Server system 12 accesses 250 the database and retrieves 252 related information from the database. The requested information is provided 254 to client system 14 by downloading the information from server 12. In one embodiment, client system 14 as well as server system 12 are protected from access by unauthorized individuals."*

This cited portion of Grewal teaches that a user logged on to a homepage in a web site may request help by selecting a hypertext link to obtain computer-assisted help. In particular, a help request is communicated to a server; the server accesses the requested information and sends it back to the requesting client. As Grewal clearly teaches at col. 1, lines 39-42, these operations are part of "an

18

integrated approach to providing users of the computer system with education, information and computer-assisted help on a specific subject, problem or a project." For the reasons already discussed, "help on a specific subject, problem, or a project" clearly does not disclose or suggest "the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type", as claim 1 recites.

Please now refer to operations 246 and 248 of figure 8, which are also cited by the Action. Referring to figure 8, operation 246 clearly teaches sending the request to the server. Operation 248 clearly teaches receiving the request by the server. For the reasons already discussed, the sent and received request of Grewal does not teach or suggest "the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type", as claim 1 recites.

In view of the above, a system of Gallagher, which teaches that a user double-clicks on a log message to receive a detailed explanation of the message, in view of Grewal, which provides users with education, information, and computer-assisted help on a specific subject, problem, or project (i.e., content specific help), does not teach or suggest "the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type", as claim 1 recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Gallagher in view of Grewal.

Claims 1-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC

19

§103(a) rejection of claims 1-9 over Gallagher in view of Grewal should be withdrawn.

Additionally, <u>claim 3</u> includes further features that are not taught or suggested by Gallagher in view of Grewal. For example, claim 3 recites "generating the second Web page in a format that is compatible with a platform of the second computer, the platform comprising a hardware platform, an operating system platform, a Web browser type indication, a software version indication, a preferred language indication, an intended use of the second computer, and/or predetermined preferences of a user." In addressing these claimed features, the Action asserts that Gallagher clearly discloses these features at col. 2, lines 24-50. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Gallagher at col. 2, lines 24-50 recites:

"In such a system 10 there is a main server 12 which is in communication with a plurality of remote agents 14, 16 and 18. Within the server is a manager 20 typically which reports the disk space available on the various applications. The manager 20 provides information on a data base 22 and also has a data log 24 which is utilized to record log messages regarding the various remote agents 14, 16 and 20 on the distributed network. In a typical system, it is typically not possible to obtain log messages readily from the remote applications. The primary way of actually obtaining those log messages is to look up in a hard copy reference document or searching through online help documentation. The other method is to actually go to the remote application and review the material on that application.

The present invention utilizes a browser capability to obtain this log information, particularly using a web based user interface which includes this log browsing capability. Furthermore, the present invention includes the ability to obtain a more detailed explanation of the log message which is currently displayed on the browser simply by double-clicking on the message within the user interface. To more specifically describe the features of the present invention,

20

refer now to FIG. 2, which is a block diagram of a distributed TCP/IP system 100 in accordance with the present invention.

Accordingly, the system 100 is very similar to that of FIG. 1 , except that the manager 120 includes a browser user interface 125."

The above-cited portion of Gallagher clearly discloses that disk space available to various applications is reported, a data log is used to record log messages, log messages are obtained via hardcopy references and online help documentation lookups, browser capabilities are used to obtain the log information, and more detailed explanation of the log messages can be presented. Nowhere does the above-cited portion of Gallagher teach or suggest "generating the second Web page in a format that is compatible with a platform of the second computer, the platform comprising a hardware platform, an operating system platform, a Web browser type indication, a software version indication, a preferred language indication, an intended use of the second computer, and/or predetermined preferences of a user", as claim 3 recites.

The Action does not rely on Grewal to teach or suggest these recited features. It is respectfully submitted that Grewal is completely silent with respect to these recited features.

Accordingly, and for these reasons alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Gallagher in view of Grewal is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 recites "providing context-sensitive help for a Web-based user interface (UI) of a first computer to a second computer", "receiving a request for a set of context sensitive help corresponding to a Web-based UI of the first computer, the request being received at the first computer, the Web-based UI comprising a user-interface object and corresponding to one or more functions of

21

the first computer, the Web-based UI being presented on the second computer, the first computer being operatively coupled to the second computer over a network, the context-sensitive help answering a 'What is the user-interface object?' or a 'Why would I use the user-interface object?' question type", and "responsive to receiving the request, the first computer: generating a second Web page comprising the context-sensitive help" and "communicating the second Web page to the second computer for presentation." For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 10 over Gallagher in view of Grewal.

Claims 11-18 depend from claim 10 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 11-18 should be withdrawn.

Additionally, <u>claim 12</u> includes further features that are not taught or suggested by Gallagher in view of Grewal. For example, claim 12 recites "generating the second Web page to be compatible with a platform of the second computer, the platform being comprising an operating system platform, a Web browser platform, a preferred language, an intended use of the second computer, and/or predetermined preferences of a user." In addressing these claimed features, the Action asserts that Gallagher clearly discloses these features at col. 2, lines 24-50. For the reasons already described above with respect to claim 3, applicant respectively disagrees. For at least those additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 recites in part "communicating the Web based UI to a different system for presentation", "responsive to receiving a request for context sensitive help, determining a set of context-sensitive help that corresponds to the Web-based UI, the Web-based UI comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help requesting a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" answer type", and "communicating the context-sensitive help to the different system for presentation." For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn.

Claims 20-25 depend from claim 19 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the respective 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 20-25 should be withdrawn.

Claim 26 recites in part "[a] user interface comprising [...]a first area for displaying, on a first device, a remote UI that corresponds to a second device the remote UI comprising a user-interface object", and "a second area within the first area for providing a context-sensitive help control for accessing a set of context sensitive help to answer a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type." For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 26.

23

Claims 27-31 depend from claim 26 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the respective 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 27-31.

Conclusion

The pending claims are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7-05-2005

By: _____
Brian G. Hart
Reg. No. 44,421
(509) 324-9256

25